

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
February 4, 2016**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Craig Krueger and Scott Waggoner

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Joseph Palmquist, Mike Nichols and Kevin Sutton

STAFF PRESENT: Gary Lee, Senior Planner and Heather Maiefski, Planner

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:00 p.m.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2015-01949, Maplewood

Description: Proposal is for a unit lot subdivision of two parallel buildings of 4 units each in the R-18 zone for a total of 8 zero-lot line townhomes with one affordable unit

Location: NE 167th Ave and NE 85th Street (Parcel 0125059114)

Applicant: Josh Beard *with* Core Design, Inc.

Prior Review Date: 11/05/2015

Staff Contact: Heather Maiefski, 425-556-2437 or hmaiefski@redmond.gov

Ms. Maiefski gave an overview of the project; this is the second pre-app meeting. This project is located on Education Hill with The Retreat and 166 townhomes as neighbors. At the first meeting, the board said they would like to see a rendering of the buildings and the applicant has provided those renderings. Staff feels this project fits in nicely with the surrounding neighborhood. Planning is looking to see the materials and architectural plans at the next meeting.

In the beginning, the site access was proposed to be in the center of the project; however, that has been shifted to the north side of the property due to safety concerns raised by the Transportation Division. This shift will require cut and fill in excess of eight feet. The wall will be constructed along the north end of the property and a small portion of said wall will be 12.5 ft. in height with the majority of the wall 10.5 ft. to 9 ft. in height. This requires a deviation which the applicant is in the process of requesting. Staff is looking forward to the second presentation with the changes made and hearing the board's comments on the project.

Mr. Margolese, a partner in the project, stated that at the last meeting the board suggested that decks should face west and have more exposure to the sun in addition to the ones facing the open space. This has been incorporated into the plans. There are more architectural elements to distinguish individual units.

Mr. Beard, with Core Design, is part of the design team for this project. There were not many above ground changes, but several superficial changes were made. The transition from the 166 Townhome project to this one with the site distance requirements was one of the larger obstacles. When 166 Townhomes were approved, there was no frontage improvements incorporated so this project was redesigned to make the profiles match with 166 Townhomes. In order to comply with the open space requirement, building 4 was relocated to the southern portion of the first building. The wall design that is being considered is soldier pile with temporary untreated timber lagging and concrete super fascia on top of that. At the base of the wall, climbing vines are proposed which would cover and reduce some of the massing of the wall. The landscape plant palate has been modified to more contemporary in nature. There will be more blub type plants in the front of the project.

Jeff Moffat is the architect on this project. The horizontal plans are relatively the same as previously presented. The plans have been enhanced from comments made at the last meeting. More porches were added and every unit will have access to the roof decks. A material color board will be at the next meeting. The centerpiece is wood siding with a warm texture. Front building and back building will be a little different to identify buildings and units. Buildings and units cascade front to back and east to west. Some of the same colors will be used in the back east side of the west building. The earthen tone color is the accent color.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Waggoner

- Asked if the south side of the building is multi-colored is there a plane change between the large panels? Mr. Moffat stated The north and south facades are flush. The materials are defined by edging.

Mr. Waggoner

- Inquired if the upper roofs are different? Mr. Moffat stated they are all lower slopes roofs, the roofs you can see from the decks will be metal and the others will be membrane.
- Mr. Waggoner also asked if the accent colored pieces are hardy panel or metal? Mr. Moffat explained that the tall vertical red will be a hardy panel type piece with a smooth texture.
- He likes the project and the color palate is great without overdoing it

Mr. Krueger

- Said he likes what has been done so far and thinks the cedar color panel with the horizontal band is very nice. He did not realize the buildings were four stories. Mr. Moffat stated that they are four stories; however, the bottom story in the east building is a garage and entrance.
- Is very happy with material and colors. Would like to see the east elevation next time
- Likes the decks on both east and west.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the shiners and some asphalt paving shown on the site plan that stop short of the south property line, was there a reason behind that? Mr. Moffat stated that the darker hatching on the plan is showing the access easement and the change in material is basically an extended driveway. The shiners will go in between that.

Mr. Meade

- Would like to see some modulation on the side elevations, even if it is just furring, there needs to be modulation between those materials especially on the big gray panels
- Would also like to see what kinds of vines have been selected for the retaining wall
- Come back next time for an approval.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00100, Alexan Central Park Apartments

Description: 8-story building with 1 level of retail and live/work tenants, 7 levels of residential apartments, mix of studio, one-and two-bedroom units. 4-level parking garage for 200 cars. Total building square footage will be 243,357 sf.

Location: 16160 NE 80th Street

Contact: Matthew Laase *with* Jackson Main Architecture

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Gary Lee gave the overview for Alexan Central Park Apartments. This is the first pre app for this project. An updated application was given to the board at this meeting. The staff concerns are that the future integrations continue to have the taller first floor to ensure that not all the floors are the same height. Staff is hoping to see some tripartite articulation in the design. The staff is interested in the colors of the cladding. Some of the issues that need to be addressed are a demonstration that the open space requirement is being met and addressing work/live units on 161st Street.

Mr. Brumbaugh, of Brumbaugh and Associates, stated that the location for the project is across the street from the proposed downtown city park. There is going to be a large bulb of driveway space in front. This is a great opportunity to extend a courtyard space. One of the elements in the park is a circular turf that is a defining element and it is being incorporated into the project. Also, the park has strong orthogonal lines in the hardscaped areas so repeating this element in the apartment complex is reviewed. There will be a sidewalk that will continue though the property and connect to the 80th walk. With the trees, there will be circular shaped seat walls with wood topping. This would be ideal for some type of food service business. There is a podium level courtyard on the 4th floor and on the east side of the building are private patio spaces. The deck space above the circular entry is the 8th floor roof deck with a sky bridge connected to the other wing of the building.

Mr. Murphy, of Jackson Main Architecture, stated the park across the street should open around the same time as the complex. The project is bounded by 80th on the south and 161st on the west and on the north side is 81st which is going to be extended. The property to the east is slated to be a multiple family building, which has below grade parking. The Alexan project is called a 5 over 3 building. It is going to be a podium building with almost an above ground parking garage which will be screened. Slide 14 shows a U shaped building that will have a bridge. The bridge is not demonstrated on the slide, but it will be at the next meeting. There will be three different surface treatments the glass plane is twisted and opens to the southeast. The orange bars are a place holder at this point. The blue color is recessed and there is screening at the base of the building.

Slide 13 shows the plans and the gray indicates the paved parking. Blue area is retail. The next level is a type 1A construction that wraps to screen the parking garage. The 4th level is the

green areas which are open to the sky; 5, 6 & 7 have open space and a bridge connecting them.

Slide 15 shows the glass and fins; the materials are still in the planning stage. Slide 16 shows the street trees. The siding being considered is very durable and no gaskets are required. It creates a watertight surface. There are two wood products that are also being considered. Brick and masonry at the base are also possibilities.

Recesses have decks, but they are not stacked. The north perspective shows the wrapping with retail spaces. East elevation shows three floors of parking. There will be a green screen wall to break up the building and hide the parking. The live/work units are proposed to face 161st and 80th respectively. The proposed retail will be focused on the plaza and towards the park. The City would like the live/work units only facing 161st. The client is concerned about changing that to retail from a viability standpoint.

This is a new prototype of building for Redmond with the 5 over 3 building. It allows the mass to open up and have light in the courtyard. All the quadrants face different areas of the site so they all have different access to light and sun.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger

- Feels that the interface of the exposed parking is going to be crucial.
- Likes what has been presented and also likes the pattern with the light and dark.
- Feels that the live/work on the south east corner could be retail. He is interested what the next iteration shows.
- Questioned the eight stories of glass. Mr. Morefield said that it is understandable that the tall glass looks ominous, so they are studying pushing some units back with balconies and bringing units some forward. They are also studying the same rhythm with the punched openings on other surfaces.

Mr. Waggoner

- Agrees with Mr. Krueger that this is a great start and will be interested to see how the building will look with the new skin.
- Agrees that the west side would not be the best side for the live/work units.
- Feels the south side may be good for regular retail with any number of different uses and might attract more activity from the park.
- Feels that the south side still is rather ominous. There have been other projects with multiple towers with bridges that have not been successful.
- Realizes this building has a large footprint and that the need for residents to use the bridges is questionable.
- Likes option two of the landscape and plaza plans.

Mr. Meade

- Agrees with option two of the landscape plans because the circular plan will relate to the park well.
- Felt that the west elevation looks good, but the park facing elevation needs more study.
- Would like to see maybe darker window frames to match instead of using white.
- Suggest that canopies on the retail spaces would help create more pedestrian zone.

- Feels that the way the building is modulated on the east is helpful.
- Noted that using three or four colors is a strong statement.
- Thinks some type of visor canopy, may be some glass sloping up away from the building might be a good way to do some weather protection.
- Likes the idea of some brick or masonry down low.
- Asked about the wood tones. Mr. Loeson stated that they are still studying if it is a stronger piece to take the white within the building or not. But he agrees the white might be distracting, so further study will be done.

Mr. Meade

- Is concerned about the railings on the decks and hopes they will match with some colors.
- Thinks there is an opportunity to put something whimsical in this building as this is a large building.

Mr. Krueger

- Understands the right side of building, but is still confused about the south side.
- Asked about the power lines that run across the front not being on the plans. Mr. Murphy stated that the power lines should be on the plans and he will ensure they appear on the next iteration.

Mr. Meade

- Feels with all the glass and spandrel panels, there needs to be a break from the window pattern so it can feel like a different opening.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WAGGONER AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:20 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).

March 17, 2016
MINUTES APPROVED ON


RECORDING SECRETARY